

ORIGINAL



0000073681

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

30 ne

COMMISSIONERS

2007 JUN -6 P 4: 23

MIKE GLEASON, Chairman
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
JEFF HATCH-MILLER
KRISTIN K. MAYES
GARY PIERCE

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
UNS GAS, INC. FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF JUST AND REASONABLE RATES AND
CHARGES DESIGNED TO REALIZE A
REASONABLE RATE OF RETURN ON THE
FAIR VALUE OF THE PROPERTIES OF UNS
GAS, INC. DEVOTED TO ITS OPERATIONS
THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF ARIZONA
CORPORATION COMMISSION.

DOCKET NO. G-04204A-06-0463

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
UNS GAS, INC. TO REVIEW AND REVISE
ITS PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTOR.

DOCKET NO. G-04204A-06-0013

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY INTO
THE PRUDENCE OF THE GAS
PROCUREMENT PRACTICES OF UNS GAS,
INC.

DOCKET NO. G-04204A-05-0831

STAFF'S NOTICE OF ERRATA FILING

On June 5, 2007, the Arizona Corporation Commission Staff ("Staff") filed its Opening Brief in the above-captioned matter. In the substitute Opening Brief which is attached, the following corrections were made: (1) final Index is included; (2) a duplicative section was eliminated; (3) various cites contained in the footnotes of the Opening Brief were corrected; (4) Mr. Mendl's name was corrected in two places of the Brief; and (5) the term "Throughput Recovery Mechanism" was corrected to "Throughput Adjustment Mechanism." Staff did not make any substantive changes to its

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED


JUN -6 2007

DOCKETED BY

nr

1 Opening Brief. Please substitute the attached corrected Opening Brief containing the changes
2 discussed above for the original Brief sent to parties yesterday.

3 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6th day of June 2007.

4
5
6 

7 Maureen A. Scott, Senior Staff Counsel
8 Keith A. Layton, Staff Attorney
9 Legal Division
10 Arizona Corporation Commission
11 1200 West Washington Street
12 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
13 (602) 542-3402

14 Original and Seventeen (17) copies
15 of the foregoing filed this 6th day
16 of June 2007 with:

17 Docket Control
18 Arizona Corporation Commission
19 1200 West Washington Street
20 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

21 Copies of the foregoing e-mailed/
22 mailed this 6th day of June
23 2007 to:


24 Michael W. Patten
25 Roshka DeWulf & Patten PLC
26 One Arizona Center
27 400 East Van Buren Street
28 Suite 800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Scott S. Wakefield
RUCO
1110 West Washington Street
Suite 220
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Raymond S. Heyman
Michelle Livengood
UniSource Energy Services
One South Church Avenue
Suite 1820
Tucson, Arizona 85701

1 Cynthia Zwick, Executive Director
2 ACAA
3 2700 North 3rd Street, Suite 3040
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

5 Marshall Magruder
6 Post Office Box 1267
7 Tubac, Arizona 85646

8 
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2
3 **COMMISSIONERS**

4 MIKE GLEASON, Chairman
5 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
6 JEFF HATCH-MILLER
7 KRISTIN K. MAYES
8 GARY PIERCE

9 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
10 UNSGAS, INC. FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT
11 OF JUST AND REASONABLE RATES AND
12 CHARGES DESIGNED TO REALIZE A
13 REASONABLE RATE OF RETURN ON THE
14 FAIR VALUE OF THE PROPERTIES OF UNS
15 GAS, INC. DEVOTED TO ITS OPERATIONS
16 THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF ARIZONA
17 CORPORATION COMMISSIONON.

DOCKET NO. G-04204A-06-0463

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
UNSGAS, INC. TO REVIEW AND REVISE
ITS PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTOR.

DOCKET NO. G-04204A-06-0013

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY INTO
THE PRUDENCE OF THE GAS
PROCUREMENT PRACTICES OF UNS GAS,
INC.

DOCKET NO. G-04204A-05-0831

STAFF'S OPENING BRIEF

INDEX

I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Staff's Overall Revenue Requirement Was Calculated in Conformance with Prior Commission Decisions and is Supported by the Record in this Case.....	2
A.	Staff's Adjustments to Rate Base are Reasonable and Should be Adopted by the Commission	2
1.	Construction Work in Progress	2
2.	Global Information System (GIS) Deferral	5
3.	Cash Working Capital	7
4.	Accumulated Deferred Income Tax (ADIT).....	7
B.	Staff's Adjustments to Operating Income are Reasonable and Should be Adopted by the Commission	8
1.	Revenue Annualization	8
2.	Weather Normalization	9
3.	Adjustment to Bad Debt Expense.....	9
4.	Depreciation and Property Taxes for CWIP	9
5.	Amortization of Deferred GIS Cost	9
6.	Incentive Compensation and Supplemental Executive Retirement Program	10
7.	Emergency Bill Assistance Expense	11
8.	Overtime Payroll Expense.....	11
9.	Payroll Tax Expense	11
10.	Nonrecurring FERC Rate Case Legal Expense	11
11.	Property Tax Expense	12
12.	Workers Compensation Expense.....	12
13.	Membership and Industry Association Dues.....	12
14.	Fleet Fuel Expense.....	13
15.	Postage Expense	13
16.	Interest Synchronization	14

1	17.	Corporate Cost Allocations	14
2	18.	Rate Case Expense	14
3	19.	CARES Related Amortization	15
4	20.	Nonrecurring Severance Payment.....	15
5	21.	Depreciation Rates	15
6	22.	Depreciation Rates	
7	C.	Staff's Cost of Capital Determination is Supported by the Record and Should be Adopted by the Commission	16
8	III.	The Commission should reject the Company's Proposed Rate Design Because it Violates the Principle of Gradulism and its Front End Loading Represents a Drastic Shift Toward a Straight-Fixed-Variable Rate Design	21
9	IV.	The Commission Should Reject the Company's Proposed Throughput Adjustment Mechanism ("TAM") Which Would Shift Risk Normally Borne by the Company to Rate Payers.....	24
10	V.	The Commission Should Find that the Company's Natural Gas Procurement Practices and Policies were Reasonable and Prudent during the Audit Review Period	25
11	VI.	The Applicant's Gas Price Stabilization Policy Should not be Approved	26
12	VII.	Staff's Recommendations for the Purchased Gas Adjustor are Reasonable, Consistent with a Policy of Gradualism, and Should be Adopted by the Commission.....	32
13	XIII.	The Commission Should Adopt Staff's Recommendations For UNS Gas' Low-Income Assistance Programs and Proposed DSM Programs; The Commission Should Not Approve Exhibit UNSG-23 in this Proceeding; and the Commission Should not Approve the Baseline Study and Include a Portion of the Costs in this Proceeding	35
14	IX.	Conclusion.....	37

1 **I. Introduction**

2 UNS Gas is a public service corporation that provides natural gas distribution services to
3 approximately 140,000 customers in Arizona. It was formerly part of the Arizona local gas
4 distribution operations of Citizens Communications Company, prior to its 2003 acquisition by
5 UniSource Energy. When UniSource Energy acquired the Arizona electric and gas assets from
6 Citizens, it formed two operating companies – UNS Gas and UNS Electric.

7 UNS Gas is requesting a revenue increase of \$9.647 million, or approximately 7 percent.
8 Commission Staff's review of the Company's case indicates that the Company is entitled to only a
9 \$4.312 million increase on fair value rate base.¹

10 The main areas of contention between the Company and Staff in this case relate to the
11 Company's multi-pronged effort to shift as much risk to ratepayers as possible. The Company does
12 this in several ways.

13 First, it tries to accomplish this risk shifting through its rate design proposals. A few notable
14 examples are its proposals to introduce a new revenue decoupling mechanism and to increase the
15 fixed customer charges, particularly for the residential class, to unprecedented and staggering levels.
16 It proposes to introduce a revenue decoupling mechanism called a TAM which would adjust for
17 variances in weather, economics and other factors, with adjustments to customer bills in order to
18 guarantee the Company's revenue stream. It proposes to increase its fixed customer charge by 143%
19 in the case of residential customers, while at the same time decreasing its per therm usage charge, a
20 proposal which on its face looks very much like a straight-fixed-variable rate design and which flies
21 in the face of the gradualism principle.

22 Second, this risk shifting strategy also takes the form of other proposals such as the
23 Company's request to include Construction Work in Progress in rate base and to use a hypothetical
24 capital structure. Each of these proposals, while appropriate in limited cases, is not appropriate in
25 this case. Their use by the Company in this case has the effect of requiring rate payers to pay more
26 than they should under normal and well-accepted rate-making principles, resulting in the rate payers
27

28

¹ Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at p. 2. The comparable increase computed by applying Staff's recommended cost of capital to Staff's adjusted original cost rate base is \$4.336 million.

1 insulating the Company from normal levels of risk and in rates designed to guarantee the Company's
2 revenue stream.

3 Staff's recommendations, on the other hand, are based upon traditional and well-accepted
4 rate-making principles which result in an equitable balance between rate payers and shareholders in
5 this case.

6 **II. The Staff's Overall Revenue Requirement Was Calculated in Conformance with Prior**
7 **Commission Decisions and is Supported by the Record in this Case**

8 UNS Gas is requesting a revenue increase of \$9.647 million, or approximately 7 percent.
9 Staff's review of the Company's case indicates that the Company has proved up a case for a \$4.312
10 million revenue increase only, based upon a historic test year ended December 31, 2005.²

11 **A. Staff's Adjustments to Rate Base are Reasonable and Should be Adopted by the**
12 **Commission**

13 The Company's proposed rate base computed on both an Original Cost and Fair Value basis
14 respectively are as follows: \$161,661,361.00 and \$191,177,715.00.³ Staff's proposed rate base
15 computed on both an Original Cost and Fair Value basis respectively are as follows:
16 \$154,541,358.00 and \$184,057,712.00.⁴ These amounts were updated in Staff's Surrebuttal
17 Testimony to \$154,547,272.00 and 184,063,625.00, respectively.⁵ The difference between the
18 Company's and Staff's proposed rate bases is \$7,114,089.00 and is due to the following major
19 differences between Staff and the Company.

20 **1. Construction Work in Progress**

21 UNS Gas proposes to include \$7.189 million of Construction Work in Progress ("CWIP") in
22 rate base.⁶ Staff removes the proposed CWIP in rate base in this case because the Commission's
23 general practice is not to allow CWIP to be included in rate base.⁷

24 The Company argues that it is necessary to include CWIP in rate base to preserve the
25 financial integrity of the Company.⁸ UNS Gas Witness Kentton Smith also argues that inclusion of

26 ² Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 4; Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 2.

27 ³ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 7.

28 ⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal), Attachment RCS-2S, Schedule B, page 1 of 2.

⁶ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 7.

⁷ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 8.

⁸ *Id.*

1 CWIP will help mitigate the effects of regulatory lag.⁹ He argues that if the Commission does not
2 include CWIP in rate base, the authorized rate of return should be increased, and the Commission
3 should consider an adjustment for plant placed into service after the test year.¹⁰

4 Staff Witness Ralph Smith provided testimony in this case on the Company's proposed
5 revenue requirement, including rate base additions, operating income, expense calculations and rate
6 design. Mr. Smith is both a CPA and an attorney with extensive experience in the utility regulatory
7 area. He is a Senior Regulatory Consultant at Larkin & Associates, PLLC.¹¹ Mr. Smith testified that
8 inclusion of CWIP in rate base is an exception to the Commission's normal practice.¹² And, the
9 Company has not met its burden of proof to justify the exceptional treatment it is requesting.

10 The Company's argument that it will be imperiled financially if CWIP is not included is not
11 persuasive. Staff's cost of capital expert, Mr. David Parcell testified that he did not believe that it was
12 necessary to provide CWIP treatment in order for UNS Gas to attract capital.¹³ The following is an
13 excerpt from his Direct Testimony on this point:

14 As I indicated above, the rating agencies describe the operations of UNS
15 Gas as low risk. It is further apparent that UNS Gas receives its financing
16 based on the credit quality of UniSource Energy and/or UES, not based on
17 the situation of the Company itself. In summary, I do not believe it is
18 necessary for UNS Gas to receive CWIP treatment in order for it to attract
19 capital.¹⁴

20 UNS Gas also accrues a return on construction projects, representing its financing costs,
21 during the construction period.¹⁵ This is called Allowance for Funds Used During Construction
22 ("AFUDC").¹⁶ When the plant is placed into service, the AFUDC becomes part of the cost of the
23 plant and is depreciated.¹⁷

24 ⁹ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at 8.

25 ¹⁰ *Id.*

26 ¹¹ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 1.

27 ¹² Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 9.

28 ¹³ Staff Ex. 36 (Parcell Direct) at 17.

¹⁴ Staff Ex. 36 (Parcell Direct) at 17.

¹⁵ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at 11.

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.*

1 Another well-established rate-making principle which supports the exclusion of CWIP from
2 rate base is that CWIP was not in service at the end of the test year,¹⁸ and therefore, it was not used
3 and useful to ratepayers during the test year. Further, to include CWIP would violate the "matching"
4 principle. It would result in a mismatch between revenue and rate base. When the plant is placed
5 into service, the Company also receives revenues from customers. It may also experience some cost
6 reductions.¹⁹ For instance, the Company could experience a reduction to maintenance expenditures
7 which would not be reflected in the test period.²⁰ Eventually, the plant is included in rate base at the
8 Company's next rate case, and rates are reset and the Company earns a cash return on the plant
9 investment, less accumulated depreciation.²¹

10 Alternatively, the Company proposes that the Commission include post-test year plant
11 additions in rate base, if the inclusion of CWIP in rate base is denied. Staff also opposes the inclusion
12 of post-test year plant in rate base since it suffers from the same flaws as the Company's proposal to
13 include CWIP in rate base.²² It is imbalanced since it fails to recognize any post-test year revenue
14 growth and maintenance expense decreases which result from the new plant's additions.²³

15 Finally, the Commission should also reject Mr. Grant's recommendation to remove
16 approximately \$4.158 million of Customer Advances from the rate base calculation, if CWIP is
17 excluded. As Mr. Smith testified, customer advances represent non-investor supplied capital and
18 should be reflected as a deduction to rate base.²⁴ Mr. Grant has not cited any prior decision to support
19 the Company's position.

20 Nor is Staff aware of an instance for any major Arizona public utility where CWIP was
21 excluded from rate base and Customer Advances were not reflected as a deduction to rate base. The
22 Commission's rules (A.A.C. R14-2-103, Appendix B, Schedule B-1) require that Customer Advances
23 be reflected as a deduction from rate base.

24
25

¹⁸ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 9.

26 ¹⁹ Id.

27 ²⁰ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 10.

28 ²¹ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at 11.

²² Staff. Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 14.

²³ Id.

²⁴ Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 15.

1 One additional reason why Customer Advances should be deducted from rate base is to
2 prevent a double rate of return. In accruing AFUDC by applying the AFUDC rate to a CWIP
3 balance, Customer Advances are typically not deducted from the construction cost base upon which
4 AFUDC is computed. If the Customer Advances have not been specifically deducted in the AFUDC
5 calculations (which would be contrary to the prescribed treatment for a utility following the AFUDC
6 formula in the FERC Uniform System of Accounts), the non-investor provided cost-free capital in the
7 form of Customer Advances needs to be reflected as a rate base deduction. Consequently, the request
8 by Company Witness Grant to adjust the balance of Customer Advances, if CWIP is excluded from
9 rate base, is contrary to precedent, would be improper for ratemaking purposes, and should be
10 rejected.

11 The Commission should reject the Company's request to include CWIP in rate base in this
12 case, or in the alternative, to recognize post-test year plant additions to rate base. The Company's
13 related adjustments to increase depreciation and property taxes relating to the inclusion of CWIP in
14 rate base should also be rejected.

15 **3. Global Information System (GIS) Deferral**

16 The Company has proposed to include approximately \$897,068 in rate base as a deferral for
17 GIS, and to prospectively amortize the deferred cost over a three-year period.²⁵ Mr. Smith testified
18 that during 2003-2005, UNS Gas undertook a project to locate and assign global positioning system
19 (GPS) information to its existing service lines in order to update the UNS Gas GIS.²⁶ The project
20 was undertaken as a result of a Commission compliance audit which found that: "Maps available at
21 the time of the audit and used by locating, leak survey, construction and emergency personnel fail to
22 include all service lines."²⁷ GIS helps the Company maintain an accurate, up-to-date record of its
23 facilities.²⁸

24 It is Staff's position that these costs should not be included in rate base for the test year.
25 These costs are non-recurring expenses that were largely incurred prior to the test year.²⁹ UNS Gas

26 ²⁵ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at 12.

27 ²⁶ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at 14.

²⁷ *Id.*

28 ²⁸ Ex. UNSG-15 (G. Smith Direct) at 6-7.

²⁹ Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 16.

1 failed to request an accounting order for Commission authorization of deferral of such costs when
2 they were being incurred.³⁰ UNS Gas should not be able to come in now and request retroactive
3 approval of the GIS costs as a "regulatory asset" to be included in rate base and amortized
4 prospectively in customer rates.³¹

5 Moreover, Staff Witness Ralph Smith explained why inclusion of GIS costs as an asset in rate
6 base is not appropriate under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles as well as generally accepted
7 ratemaking principles:

8 ...Under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), such
9 costs were required to be expensed in the period incurred. The
10 company had initially applied a capitalization treatment of such costs,
11 but determined that that was an error and a violation of GAAP, and has
12 recorded an entry on its books to expense such costs. For accounting
13 purposes, the GIS costs are expenses, not an investment. The
appropriate treatment for non-recurring expenses, especially ones
relating to periods prior to the test year and for which deferral for
accounting purposes was not pre-approved, is to exclude them from
rates. Staff's proposed treatment does this.³²

14 The Company's own internal documentation obtained by Staff during discovery indicate that
15 the Company initially decided to treat GIS as an "investment" or asset but later determined that
16 capitalization would be inappropriate under GAAP.³³

17 The Company seems to believe that it is somehow disadvantaged by its inability to recoup this
18 expense as part of the 2005 test year. However, it is not at all uncommon or unusual for a utility's
19 investors to be responsible for expenses which occur in between rate cases and to be responsible for
20 expenses which are incurred outside of a test year. As Staff Witness Ralph Smith pointed out in his
21 Rebuttal Testimony, the flip-side to this is that the utility's investors also benefit from cost decreases
22 and increased revenues that occur between rate cases.³⁴

23 The Company's proposal to include deferred GIS costs as a "regulatory asset" in rate base
24 should be rejected for the reasons provided by Staff Witness Smith. The Company's related proposal
25 for prospectively charging ratepayers for an amortization of such expenses should also be rejected.

26 ³⁰ Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at p. 16.

27 ³¹ Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at p. 16.

³² Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at p. 17.

28 ³³ Staff Ex. 27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at p. 18.

³⁴ *Id.*

1 **3. Cash Working Capital**

2 Staff Witness Ralph Smith explained the concept of "Cash Working Capital" in his Direct
3 Testimony as follows:

4 Cash working capital is the cash needed by the Company to cover its
5 day-to-day operations. If the Company's cash expenditures, on an
6 aggregate basis,³⁵ precede the cash recovery of expenses, investors
7 must provide cash working capital. In that situation a positive cash
8 working capital requirement exists. On the other hand, if revenues are
9 typically received prior to when expenditures are made, on average,
 then ratepayers provide the cash working capital to the utility, and the
 negative cash working capital allowance is reflected as a reduction to
 rate base. In this case, the cash working capital requirement is a
 reduction to rate base as ratepayers are essentially supplying these
 funds.³⁶

10 Mr. Smith testified that UNS Gas has a negative cash working capital requirement which
11 means that ratepayers are essentially supplying the funds used for the day-to-day operations of the
12 Company. While UNS Gas performed a lead/lag study, Staff's calculations show that the Company's
13 proposed working capital of negative \$1.045 million should be increased to negative \$268,272.³⁷

14 **4. Accumulated Deferred Income Tax (ADIT)**

15 Due to the above adjustments, Staff further adjusted rate base by \$195,336 to account for the
16 following:

- 17 1) removal of the ADIT related to the GIS deferral that UNS Gas added to rate
18 base that was removed by Staff;
19 2) removal of the ADIT related to the Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan
 (SERP); and
20 3) removal of 50% of the ADIT related to incentive compensation.³⁸

21 UNS presented no rebuttal contesting these adjustments. These adjustments to ADIT are
22 necessary to properly coordinate the rate base with the components of net operating income and
23 should be adopted.

24
25
26
27 ³⁵ Staff Ex. 25 (Smith Direct) at p. 18.

28 ³⁶ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 18.

³⁷ Staff Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal), Attachment RCS-2S, Schedule B, page 1.

³⁸ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 19.

1 **B. Staff's Adjustments to Operating Income are Reasonable and Should be Adopted**
2 **by the Commission**

3 1. Revenue Annualization

4 The revenue annualization adjusts revenues to reflect the growth in customers that occurred
5 throughout the test year.³⁹ Staff utilized the "traditional approach" in calculating customer revenue
6 annualization. Staff's revenue annualization resulted in \$102,433 more gas revenue (excluding
7 purchased gas) than did the revenue annualization proposed by UNS Gas. Staff thus adjusted the
8 Company's operating income accordingly.⁴⁰

9 Under the traditional approach, Staff calculated the difference between actual December 2005
10 customers, by rate class, and the number of customers in each of the other months of the test year.
11 The change in customers to an annualized year-end level was then multiplied by the customer charge
12 and margin amounts applicable to that rate class. Staff used the same customer charge and margin
13 amounts used by UNS Gas.⁴¹

14 However, the Company claims that Staff's use of the "traditional approach" in this case was
15 inappropriate. Staff disagrees. As Staff Witness Smith testified, the traditional method of customer
16 annualization has been effective in coordinating the revenue element of the ratemaking formula with
17 the other components, such as rate base.⁴² Many of the arguments raised by UNS Gas against its use
18 in this case have no merit. In addition, any method for determining an appropriate annualization
19 adjustment should be straight-forward and transparent so as to allow others to replicate and verify its
20 results.⁴³ The traditional approach meets these criteria. The Company's approach which applied
21 percentage "growth factors" instead of customer bill counts, were very difficult to follow and
22 replicate and appear to actually understate growth.⁴⁴

23
24
25
26 ³⁹ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 19.

27 ⁴⁰ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 20.

28 ⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 21.

⁴³ *Id.* at 24.

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 24.

1 2. Weather Normalization

2 Staff's weather normalization adjustment increases retail revenue by \$1,962. Staff's
3 adjustment varies from the weather normalization adjustment proposed by UNS Gas because the
4 weighted average number of customers, in Staff's annualization, exceeded the corresponding level
5 reflected in UNS Gas' corresponding annualization. Both the Staff and the UNS Gas weather
6 normalization adjustments reflect an increase to revenue because the test year was warmer than
7 normal.⁴⁵

8 3. Adjustment to Bad Debt Expense

9 The differences in Bad Debt Expense between Staff and UNS Gas relate not to the calculation
10 method, but rather are driven by the impact of the revenue adjustments. UNS Gas Witness Mr.
11 Dukes stated at page 2 of his Rebuttal Testimony that the differences in Bad Debt Expense between
12 UNS Gas and Staff result from the different customer annualization and weather normalization
13 adjustments, and, other than that, UNS Gas and Staff are basically in agreement on the calculation.⁴⁶

14 4. Depreciation and Property Taxes for CWIP

15 This adjustment removes the pro forma amounts calculated by UNS Gas for depreciation and
16 property taxes related to the Company's proposal to include CWIP in rate base. As explained above,
17 Staff disagrees with the Company's proposal to include CWIP in rate base, and the Company's
18 alternative proposal to include post-test year plant in rate base.⁴⁷

19 5. Amortization of Deferred GIS Cost

20 This adjustment removes the Company's proposed amortization of \$299,023. During 2004-
21 2005, UNS undertook a project to locate and assign global positioning system (GPS) information to
22 its existing service lines in order to update the UNS Gas GIS. Part of the basis for this request by the
23 Company is that the project has a benefit to future periods. However, these expenses largely were
24 incurred in prior periods and are nonrecurring. Without seeking Commission pre-approval, UNS Gas
25 is now requesting deferral treatment for costs that should have been expensed in periods prior to the
26

27
28 ⁴⁵ Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 25.

⁴⁶ Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 26.

⁴⁷ Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 26.

1 test year. Staff disagrees with the Company's proposal to amortize such costs prospectively over a
2 three-year period.⁴⁸

3 6. Incentive Compensation and Supplemental Executive Retirement
4 Program

5 Staff adjusted the Company's expenses associated with various incentive compensation plans,
6 including the Performance Enhancement Plan ("PEP"). Staff adjusted the amount of the expense
7 related to almost all of these programs by 50%.⁴⁹ Incentive compensation programs benefit both
8 shareholders and ratepayers. The removal of 50% of the expense related to such programs provides
9 an equal sharing of the cost of such programs between shareholders and ratepayers, since the
10 programs benefit both groups.⁵⁰

11 Staff also removed 100% of the expense associated with the Supplemental Executive
12 Retirement Plan (SERP).⁵¹ This plan provides supplemental retirement benefits for select executives
13 of UNS Gas.⁵² SERPs typically provide for retirement benefits in excess of the limits placed by IRS
14 regulations on pension plan calculations for salaries in excess of specified amounts.⁵³

15 Staff's adjustments are consistent with the Commission's recent decision in the last Southwest
16 Gas rate case. In the Southwest Gas case, the Commission adopted Staff's recommendation for an
17 equal sharing of incentive compensation plan costs and RUCO's recommendation to remove SERP
18 expense in its entirety. In the following passage from that Order, the Commission addressed the
19 removal of SERP expense:

20 Although we rejected RUCO's arguments on this issue in the
21 Company's last rate proceeding, we believe that the record in this case
22 supports a finding that the provision of additional compensation to
23 Southwest Gas' highest paid employees to remedy a perceived
24 deficiency in retirement benefits relative to the company's other
25 employees is not a reasonable expense that should be recovered in
26 rates. Without the SERP, the Company's officers still enjoy the same
27 retirement benefits available to any other Southwest Gas employee and
28 the attempt to make these executives 'whole' in the sense of allowing a
 greater percentage of retirement benefits does not meet the test of

26 ⁴⁸ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 22.

27 ⁴⁹ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 23.

28 ⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 24.

⁵³ *Id.*

1 reasonableness. If the Company wishes to provide additional
2 retirement benefits above the level permitted by IRS regulations
3 applicable to all other employees it may do so at the expense of its
shareholders. However, it is not reasonable to place this additional
burden on ratepayers.⁵⁴

4 The Company has not presented any rationale or support for the Commission to treat its
5 incentive compensation plans differently for ratemaking purposes than the Commission's treatment
6 of similar plans in the last Southwest Gas rate case.

7 **7. Emergency Bill Assistance Expense**

8 UNS Gas has accepted this Staff adjustment, which increases test year expense to be included
9 in the base rate revenue requirement determination by \$21,600 to provide for an increase requested
10 by the Company for emergency bill assistance.

11 **8. Overtime Payroll Expense**

12 Staff proposed an adjustment to reduce the Company's proposed amount of test year overtime
13 payroll expense by \$123,010.⁵⁵ At Page 17 of his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Dukes indicates that he
14 agrees with this Staff adjustment, which reduced the amount of pro forma expense in the Company's
15 payroll adjustment, because it is more reflective of the expected overtime levels that should be
16 included in rates.

17 **9. Payroll Tax Expense**

18 Staff proposes reducing the pro forma payroll tax expense in UNS Gas' filing by \$9,348 to
19 reflect the Staff adjustments to overtime payroll and incentive compensation expense.⁵⁶

20 **10. Nonrecurring FERC Rate Case Legal Expense**

21 The Staff also made an adjustment to normalize legal expenses for the test year. As
22 explained by Staff Witness Ralph Smith, during the 2005 test year, UNS Gas incurred substantial
23 legal expenses related to settlement discussions in the El Paso Natural Gas rate case at the Federal
24 Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC").⁵⁷ That case ultimately settled. The associated expenses
25 included by UNS Gas amounted to \$311,051. Since they are nonrecurring, they should be removed.⁵⁸

26 ⁵⁴ Decision No. 68487 at 19.

27 ⁵⁵ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 28.

⁵⁶ Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 34.

28 ⁵⁷ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 30.

⁵⁸ *Id.*

1 **11. Property Tax Expense**

2 This adjustment is necessary to reflect the known statutory assessment ratio of 24 percent
3 applicable for 2007. The Arizona State Legislature passed House Bill No. 2779 which set a new rate
4 schedule for property tax assessments. The new assessment rate schedule provides for decreasing the
5 25 percent rate applicable in 2005 in 0.5 percent steps each year until a 20 percent rate is attained in
6 2015. The Company's calculation used a 24.5 percent assessment rate and thus fails to recognize the
7 impact of this known tax change prospectively.

8 The current assessment rate in 2007 is 24%. Staff concluded that since the Commission
9 approved rates are expected to become effective in mid-2007, and the Company's anticipated rate
10 case interval is three years, as evidenced by the Company's proposed normalization period for rate
11 case expense, the property tax rate that will be in effect for 2007 of 24% is appropriate.⁵⁹

12 In terms of determining the recommended assessment rate, Staff compared its
13 recommendation in the current UNS Gas rate case with a similar determination in the recent
14 Southwest Gas rate case. In the Southwest Gas case, Southwest Gas, Staff and RUCO all ultimately
15 agreed on the appropriateness of using a 24.5% assessment rate effective for 2006 in conjunction
16 with the test year in that case ending August 31, 2004. As explained in Staff Witness Smith's Direct
17 and Surrebuttal Testimony, the appropriateness of using the known 24% assessment rate in the
18 current UNS Gas rate case is supported by the comparison with Southwest Gas.

19 **12. Workers Compensation Expense**

20 UNS Gas has accepted Staff's adjustment, which reversed a UNS Gas' proposed adjustment
21 to increase test year expense for using a cash basis, rather than an accrual accounting basis, for
22 recognizing worker's compensation expenses for ratemaking purposes.

23 **13. Membership and Industry Association Dues**

24 Staff removed 40% of UNS Gas' 2005 American Gas Association ("AGA") dues for 2005,
25 which were \$41,854.00. Staff also removed other discretionary membership and industry association
26 dues which are not needed for the "safe and reliable provision of gas utility service."⁶⁰

27
28 ⁵⁹ Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 36.

⁶⁰ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 35.

1 Staff's proposed disallowance is reasonable for several reasons. First, according to NARUC
2 sponsored audits of 1999 AGA expenditures, "...these expense categories may be viewed by some
3 State commissions as potential vehicles for charging ratepayers with such costs as lobbying,
4 advocacy or promotional activities which may not be to their benefit."⁶¹ Second, from the latest
5 NARUC Audit Report on AGA expenditures that Staff was able to locate dated June 2001, for the
6 twelve-month period ended December 31, 1999, it appears that 41.65% of 1999 AGA expenditures
7 related to lobbying and advertising.⁶²

8 The total amount of test year expense for membership dues removed by Staff was \$26,868.⁶³

9 **14. Fleet Fuel Expense**

10 Staff and UNS Gas are in agreement concerning the necessary adjustment for fleet fuel
11 expense. Staff revised its originally proposed adjustment to reflect the amount shown in UNS Gas'
12 Rebuttal testimony. This adjustment reduces operating expense in UNS Gas' original filing by
13 \$12,657.⁶⁴

14 **15. Postage Expense**

15 Staff's revised postage expense adjustment used a starting point of \$445,171 for the
16 adjustment calculation. Staff witness Smith accepted \$445,171 as the appropriate starting point for
17 the calculation, as discussed in UNS Gas witness Dukes' rebuttal testimony at pages 19-20. This
18 produces an annualized postage expense of \$476,960. An annualized postage expense of \$476,960
19 properly recognizes the postage expense increase that occurred on January 8, 2006 and the customer
20 growth that occurred during the 2005 test year. Staff also reflected the known and measurable May
21 14, 2007 postage increase that raised the cost of a first class letter from \$0.39 to \$0.41. Staff
22 recommends allowing annualized postage expense of \$503,356. The adjustment to the \$529,380
23 amount in the UNS Gas filing would be a decrease of \$26,024.⁶⁵

24 At page 20 of his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Dukes referenced what he called a "known and
25 measurable" amount of postage expense for 2006 and suggests that, because of that 2006 expense, the

26 ⁶¹ *Id.* at 36.

27 ⁶² *Id.*

28 ⁶³ *Id.* at 38.

⁶⁴ Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal), Attachment RCS-2S, Schedule C-15.

⁶⁵ Ex S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 39-40.

1 Company's originally proposed postage request of \$529,380 should be used. The 2006 postage
2 expense amount would reflect customer growth beyond the end of the test year, and the related
3 revenues resulting from such customer growth beyond the end of the test year have not been
4 reflected. Customer growth has only been reflected through December 31, 2005, the end of the test
5 year. Reflecting increased postage expense related to post-test year growth in the number of
6 customers without reflecting the related additional revenues is inappropriate and should be rejected.⁶⁶

7 **16. Interest Synchronization**

8 This adjustment decreases income tax expense by the amount shown on Ex-27 (Smith
9 Surrebuttal) Attachment RCS-2S, Schedule C-17 and increases the Company's achieved operating
10 income by a similar amount. It is necessary to coordinate the income tax calculation with the rate
11 base and cost of capital. UNS Gas and Staff are in agreement on the methodology for calculating the
12 adjustment.

13 **17. Corporate Cost Allocations**

14 RUCO discovered some additional non-recurring charges related to an attempted merger and
15 has correctly proposed to remove such costs. UNS Gas and Staff agreed with that RUCO adjustment
16 which reduces expense by \$12,765.⁶⁷

17 **18. Rate Case Expense**

18 Staff proposes a rate case expense allowance of \$85,000.00 per year, based on a total of
19 \$255,000 normalized over three years.⁶⁸ RUCO proposed an allowance of \$83,667 per year, based
20 on limiting the total amount to \$251,000 over three years. The amount requested by UNS Gas for
21 rate case expense is 3.8 times as high as the amount of rate case expense allowed by the Commission
22 in the Southwest Gas rate case. While Southwest Gas is a larger utility than UNS Gas, the scope of
23 the issues were similar.

24 While the current case may be the first rate case for this utility operation under its current
25 ownership, it is not the first rate case for this utility. This gas utility had periodic, recurring rate cases
26

27 ⁶⁶ Ex S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) 40-41.

28 ⁶⁷ Ex S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) 41.

⁶⁸ Ex S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) 42.

1 under its prior ownership by Citizens Utilities. The transfer of ownership should not be an excuse for
2 charging ratepayers for what appear to be excessive amounts of rate case cost.

3 Moreover, the current UNS Gas rate case is similar to and presents many of the same issues,
4 such as a proposed revenue decoupling mechanism, revisions to the PGA mechanism, etc., that were
5 recently addressed by the Commission in Docket No. G-01551A-04-0876, a rate case involving the
6 other large gas distribution utility in the state, Southwest Gas Corporation. Staff believes that the
7 Southwest Gas case provides a reasonable benchmark for what a reasonable allowance for rate case
8 cost should be in the current UNS Gas rate case.

9 **19. CARES Related Amortization**

10 Staff recommends that UNS Gas cease deferral of costs related to the CARES program
11 effective with the date for new rates established in this case. Staff has recognized CARES program
12 discounts in Staff's proposed rate design. Staff also recognizes that UNS Gas has accumulated some
13 deferred costs related to the CARES program. Staff witness Ms. McNeely-Kirwan presented the
14 recommendation concerning how those accumulated deferred CARES costs should be amortized for
15 ratemaking purposes. Staff's adjustment reduces the operating expense in UNS Gas' filing by
16 \$441,511.

17 **20. Nonrecurring Severance Payment**

18 Staff had proposed, but withdrew, an adjustment to remove a nonrecurring severance
19 expense related to a UNS Gas employee.⁶⁹ Staff disagrees with the attempt by UNS Gas that was
20 presented in the Company's rebuttal testimony of Mr. Dukes to revise its filing to add this
21 nonrecurring severance expense back twice.⁷⁰

22 **21. Depreciation Rates**

23 Staff is in agreement with the Company's proposed new depreciation rates.⁷¹ On December
24 31, 2005 plant investment, the difference between the current and proposed new depreciation rates
25 produce a decrease in annualized depreciation expense for the Company of \$610,980.00.⁷² However,
26

27 ⁶⁹ Ex S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 33.

28 ⁷⁰ Ex S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 33.

⁷¹ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 63.

⁷² Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 39.

1 Staff Witness Smith recommended that each of the new depreciation rates proposed by UNS Gas
2 should be clearly broken out between (1) a service life rate and (2) a net salvage rate. Staff Witness
3 Smith explained that by doing this, the depreciation expense related to the inclusion of estimated
4 future cost of removal in depreciation rates can be tracked and accounted for by plant account.⁷³

5 C. Staff's Cost of Capital Determination is Supported by the Record and Should be
6 Adopted by the Commission

7 Staff Witness Parcell presented the Staff's position on cost of capital in this case. Mr. Parcell
8 holds a B.A. and M.A. degrees in economics from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
9 (Virginia Tech) and a M.B.A. from Virginia Commonwealth University. He has been a consulting
10 economist with Technical Associates since 1970 and has filed testimony and/or testified in over 375
11 utility proceedings before about 35 regulatory agencies in the United States and Canada.

12 Mr. Parcell recommended using the actual capital structure of the Company which consists of
13 55.33% long-term debt and 44.67% equity. Mr. Parcell recommended a long-term debt rate of 6.6%.
14 He recommended a cost of equity of 10.0 percent (the midpoint between 9.5% and 10.5%). This
15 equated to an overall cost of capital recommendation for UNS Gas of 8.12%.

16 There are two areas of disagreement between the Company and Staff. The Staff and the
17 Company are in agreement on 6.6% cost of debt. The first area of disagreement is the capital
18 structure for UNS Gas and the second area of disagreement is with the cost of equity. The Company
19 is proposing a hypothetical capital structure in this case of 50% equity and 50% long-term debt.
20 Because the actual equity ratio of the Company is 44.6%, use of the Company's recommended
21 hypothetical capital structure would increase the actual return on equity to a level exceeding that
22 intentionally approved by the Commission.⁷⁴

23 Staff Witness Parcell actually demonstrated that use of the Company's recommended
24 hypothetical capital structure would be the equivalent of giving the Company an 11.5% return on
25 equity using its actual capital structure, which would be excessive in this case.⁷⁵

27 ⁷³ Ex. S-25 (Smith Direct) at 63.

28 ⁷⁴ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at 20.

⁷⁵ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at 21.

Hypothetical Capital Structure

	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Wgt. Cost</u>
Debt	50%	6.6%	3.65%
Equity	50%	11.0%	5.15%
Total			8.80%

Actual Capital Structure

	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Wgt. Cost</u>
Debt	55.33%	6.6%	3.65%
Equity	44.67%	11.5%	5.15%
			8.80%

The use of a hypothetical capital structure would have the impact of increasing the actual return on equity by 50 basis points.⁷⁶ This is just another means of adjusting for risk; which is not necessary because Staff has already included an appropriate risk adjustment given the Company's actual capital structure. If a hypothetical structure is used, Staff's return on equity would overestimate the Company's risk.

The cost of equity is typically the most contentious part of the overall weighted cost of capital determination. Mr. Parcell utilized methodologies well accepted by the industry and two of which have been extensively utilized by this Commission in the past: the Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCF), the Capital Asset Pricing Model ("CAPM") and the Comparable Earnings Method ("CE").

Since UNS Gas is not a publicly-traded company, it is not possible to directly apply cost of equity models to this entity.⁷⁷ While its parent, UniSource Energy, is publicly-traded, the parent's recent financial situation and diversified nature make its results of limited value.⁷⁸ Thus, Mr. Parcell used 2 groups of comparison or "proxy" companies as a substitute for UNS Gas to determine its cost of equity.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 21.

⁷⁷ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 23.

⁷⁸ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 23.

⁷⁹ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 23.

1 The two sample groups chosen by Mr. Parcell consisted of the following: 1) a group of nine
2 combination electric and gas companies and 2) a group of 11 natural gas utilities used by UNS Gas
3 witness Grant in his cost of capital analysis.⁸⁰

4 The first model utilized by Mr. Parcell was the DCF model which was described in the
5 following passage from Mr. Parcell's Direct Testimony:

6 The discounted cash flow model is one of the oldest, as well as the
7 most commonly-used, models for estimating the cost of common equity
8 for public utilities. The DCF model is based on the 'dividend discount
9 model' of financial theory, which maintains that the value (price) of
any security or commodity is the discounted present value of all future
cash flows.⁸¹

10 Based upon Mr. Parcell's analysis, a range of 9.25% to 10.5% was found to represent the
11 current DCF cost of equity for the proxy groups.⁸²

12 Staff Witness Parcell then utilized the CAPM model which describes and measures the
13 relationship between a security's investment risk and its market rate of return.⁸³ Mr. Parcell's CAPM
14 results indicate a cost of equity between 9.5% and 10.25%.⁸⁴

15 While not utilized or relied upon by this Commission extensively in the past, Mr. Parcell also
16 conducted a Comparable Earnings analysis.⁸⁵ The CE method is designed to measure the returns
17 expected to be earned on the original cost book value of similar risk enterprises.⁸⁶

18 Staff Witness Parcell further elaborated on this method in his prefled testimony:

19 It is generally recognized for utilities that market-to-book ratios of
20 greater than one (i.e. 100%) reflect a situation where a company is able
21 to attract new equity capital without dilution of book value. As a result,
maintenance of a stock price above book value is one measure of the
fairness of a utility's authorized cost of equity.⁸⁷

22 Staff Witness Parcell also explained that his CE analysis was based upon market data
23 (through the use of market-to-book ratios) and is thus essentially a market test, which makes it less
24

25 ⁸⁰ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 23.

26 ⁸¹ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 25.

27 ⁸² Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 25.

28 ⁸³ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 28.

⁸⁴ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 28.

⁸⁵ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 31.

⁸⁶ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 31.

⁸⁷ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 31.

1 susceptible to the criticisms occasionally made by some who argue that past earned returns do not
2 represent the cost of capital.⁸⁸ Based upon recent earnings and market-to-book ratios, Mr. Parcell's
3 CE analysis yielded a cost of equity for the proxy utilities of no more than 10%.⁸⁹

4 To summarize, Mr. Parcell's results under the three methods are as follows:

5 Discounted Cash Flow	9.25-10.5% (9.88% mid-point)
6 Capital Asset Pricing Model	9.5-10.25% (9.88% mid-point)
Comparable Earnings	10.0%

7 The resulting total cost of capital is a range of 7.89% to 8.34%, with a mid-point of 8.12%.
8 Staff Witness Parcell's overall recommendation on total cost of capital is the mid-point of this range
9 or 8.12%.⁹⁰

10 Company Witness Grant's recommendation of a 11.0% cost of common equity is based upon
11 the following:

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Median</u>
12 DCF	9.1-10.5%	9.9%
13 CAPM	9.9-11.7%	11.0%

14 Mr. Grant's recommendation of 11.0%, represents the highest median of his two analyses.
15 There are also concerns with his risk-free rate and his risk premium inputs. His 5.3% risk free rate is
16 out-dated⁹¹ Mr. Grant also made an adjustment for the size of UNS Gas which was not appropriate.⁹²

17 In his Rebuttal testimony, UNS Gas Witness Grant also relies upon a recent decision
18 (unpublished) by the Arizona Court of Appeals involving Chaparral City Water Company to suggest
19 the Commission simply apply the weighted cost of capital (or overall rate of return) to the
20 Company's fair value rate base for purposes of setting rates in this proceeding.⁹³ While this decision
21 is still being evaluated by the Staff, Staff does not agree with the Company's interpretation of the
22 Chaparral City Water Company case as set forth in Mr. Grant's Rebuttal Testimony.

23 First, Mr. Grant must have missed page 13 of that decision wherein the Court of Appeals,
24 stated the following, "the Commission asserts that it was not bound to use the weighted average cost
25

26 ⁸⁸ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 32.

27 ⁸⁹ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 33.

28 ⁹⁰ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 36.

⁹¹ Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 37.

⁹² Ex. S-36 (Parcell Direct) at p. 38.

⁹³ Ex. UNSG -28 (Grant Rebuttal) at 28.

1 of capital as the rate of return to be applied to the FVRB. The Commission is correct.” In other
2 words, the Court stated that the Commission is not bound to do exactly what Mr. Grant is suggesting
3 the Commission do in the UNS Gas case. At page 13 of the decision, the Court also stated “if the
4 Commission determines that the cost of capital analysis is not the appropriate methodology to
5 determine the rate of return to be applied to the FVRB, the Commission has the discretion to
6 determine the appropriate methodology.”

7 Second, the methodology advocated by Mr. Grant would result in an unreasonable and
8 excessive return on equity to the Company, for the reasons discussed in Mr. Parcell’s testimony.⁹⁴
9 Mr. Parcell testified that based upon over 35 years of providing cost of capital testimony, the entire
10 concept of cost of capital is designed to apply to an original cost rate base.⁹⁵ He further testified that
11 when the concept of fair value rate base is incorporated, the link between rate base and capital
12 structure is broken, in the following manner:⁹⁶

13 The ‘excess’ of fair value rate base over original cost rate base is not
14 financed with investor-supplied funds and, indeed, the excess is not
15 financed at all. As a result, the cost of capital cannot be applied to the
fair value rate base since there is no financial link between the two
concepts.⁹⁷

16 While Staff is still reviewing the Court decision, Mr. Parcell offers a solution which
17 recognizes this difference, which the Company’s analysis has overlooked. Since the differential
18 between fair value rate base and original cost rate base is not financed with investor-supplied funds, it
19 is appropriate to attribute no cost to this ‘excess’ amount.⁹⁸ Such an analysis provides for a return
20 being earned on all investor-supplied funds which is consistent with sound financial and regulatory
21 standards.⁹⁹

22
23
24
25
26 ⁹⁴ Ex. S-27 (Smith Surrebuttal) at 5.

27 ⁹⁵ Ex. S-37 (Parcell Surrebuttal) at 8.

⁹⁶ *Id.*

⁹⁷ *Id.* at 9.

28 ⁹⁸ Ex. S-37 (Parcell Surrebuttal) at 9.

⁹⁹ *Id.*

1 **III. The Commission should reject the Company's Proposed Rate Design Because it**
2 **Violates the Principle of Gradulism and its Front End Loading Represents a Drastic**
3 **Shift Toward a Straight-Fixed-Variable Rate Design.**

4 Like the majority of the Company's proposals in this case, the Company's rate design
5 proposal is designed to shift almost all risk to rate-payers in the future. Rate design issues were
6 addressed by Staff Witness Steven Ruback, who is a lawyer and engineer with more than 25 years of
7 experience as a rate consultant primarily in the gas and electric industries.¹⁰⁰ His principle areas of
8 concentration are: 1) cost allocation studies; 2) class revenue requirements; 3) rate design;
9 4) unbundling; 5) transportation issues; 6) competition; 7) restructuring; 8) design day forecasting;
10 9) gas supply; 10) PGA and procurement issues; 11) hedging; and 12) related policy issues.¹⁰¹

11 Most notable about the Company's proposal is a "staggering" increase in the fixed customer
12 charges for all classes of service.¹⁰² Mr. Ruback testified that the most extreme customer charge
13 proposed by the Company, however, is for the Residential class, which the Company proposes to
14 increase by 185% during the summer period and 57% during the winter period.¹⁰³ But other classes
15 would also experience sharp customer charge increases.¹⁰⁴

16 According to Mr. Ruback, the Company's proposal presents a serious front end loading
17 problem, a decoupling issue and a gradualism problem, especially with respect to the Residential
18 class.¹⁰⁵ That class alone would see their customer charge increase by approximately 143%.¹⁰⁶ Put
19 another way, the Company is proposing to collect an increase of \$14.6 million in the Residential
20 R-10 rate class under its proposed customer charges, but the Company is only requesting a total
21 increase of \$6.58 million for the Residential class.¹⁰⁷ Mr. Ruback testified that "[i]ncreasing the
22 customer charges to provide more revenue than the proposed revenue increase requires that existing
23 volumetric rates be reduced, which further decreases the Company's risk."¹⁰⁸

24
25 ¹⁰⁰ Ex. S-23 (Ruback Direct) at 1.

26 ¹⁰¹ *Id.*

27 ¹⁰² *Id.*

28 ¹⁰³ Ex. S-23 (Ruback Direct) at 3.

¹⁰⁴ *Id.*

¹⁰⁵ Ex. S-23 (Ruback Direct) at 4.

¹⁰⁶ *Id.*

¹⁰⁷ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁰⁸ *Id.*

1 Mr. Ruback further testified that UNS' proposal "is extreme because the proposed customer
2 charges are intended to recover all of the proposed increase plus some of the margin recovered in
3 existing volumetric rate."¹⁰⁹ It is not uncommon for utilities to propose increases in fixed charges to
4 recover a disproportionate amount of the proposed revenue increase. But UNS Gas has gone much
5 further in this case and has proposed to recover all of the proposed increase and some of the
6 volumetric margin recovered in existing rates.¹¹⁰

7 The Company's proposal is also a step toward a Straight-Fixed-Variable rate design. Mr.
8 Ruback testified as to the inappropriateness of such a rate design to retail gas distribution:

9 The SFV pipeline rate design is not appropriate for retail distribution
10 rate design because the theoretical underpinning of the SFV pipeline
11 rate design does not apply to distribution service. FERC's SFV was
12 implemented to ration pipeline design day capacity by price. The SFV
13 method should not be applicable to distribution service because there is
no need to ration retail distribution capacity. There is no need to ration
UNS' distribution capacity since UNS has no distribution constraints
and has not had to curtail distribution service over the last 5 years.¹¹¹

14 Mr. Ruback further testified that based upon his experience, other jurisdictions allow for
15 reasonable fixed customer charges and reasonable fixed demand charges, but require the bulk of the
16 distribution revenue requirement to be recovered over throughput.¹¹²

17 Staff, on the other hand, considered cost of service, the desire to encourage energy
18 conservation, the need to use gradualism, and other factors in determining an appropriate rate design
19 for the Company.¹¹³ Staff Witness Smith's Schedule RCS-S1 shows Staff's rate design calculations
20 in this case.

21 Staff has proposed an across-the-board base rate revenue increase of 11.80%, excluding the
22 Residential CARES class.¹¹⁴ This is much lower than the average percent increase proposed by UNS
23
24
25

26 ¹⁰⁹ Ex. S-23(Ruback Direct) at 6.

¹¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹¹ *Id.* at 9.

¹¹² Ex. S-23 (Ruback Direct) at p. 10.

¹¹³ Ex. S-26 (Smith Supplemental Direct) at 2.

¹¹⁴ *Id.* at 5.

1 Gas of 21.11.¹¹⁵ For the Residential CARES rate, Staff proposed a revenue increase of 4.54% as
2 opposed to the 21.11% increase proposed by the Company.¹¹⁶

3 Staff's proposed rate design also reflects a much more gradual approach to increasing
4 customer charges, than the Company's proposal. Of the \$4.962 million proposed base rate increase,
5 approximately \$2.560 million (52%) is collected through fixed charges. Under Staff's proposal, the
6 residential customer charge would increase from \$7.00 to \$8.50.¹¹⁷ Further, rather than a reduction in
7 the per therm margin proposed by UNS Gas for residential customers, Staff's proposed rate design
8 recommends that the distribution margin be set at \$0.3217 per therm.¹¹⁸

9 Staff Witness Smith explains the impact of Staff's proposal on the average residential
10 customer on page 9 of his Supplemental Direct Testimony:

11 As shown on Attachment RCS-S2, page 1 of 10, an R-10 customer
12 using 100 therms would see their total bill increase from \$115.48 to
13 \$119.11, for an increase of \$3.63 per month, or 3.14 percent. The
14 corresponding increase in base rates only would be from \$37.04 to
15 \$40.67, an increase of 9.80 percent per month. Bill impacts for a range
16 of other monthly usage levels for residential customer (Rate R-10) are
17 also presented on Attachment RCS-S2, page 1 of 10. As shown there,
18 total bill increases at Staff's recommended rates range from 2.21
percent (at 500 therms) to 12.96 percent (at 5 therms). Base rate
increases (excluding gas costs), range from 7.72 percent (at 500
therms) to 18.94 percent (at 5 therms). At average January usage of 87
therms per month, the proposed increase of \$3.36 equates to a 3.31
percent increase in a residential customer's total monthly bill, or a
10.14 percent increase in the non-gas cost portion of the customer's
bill.¹¹⁹

19 The impacts on the average bills of other customer classes are discussed on pages 9-13 of
20 Staff Witness Smith's Supplemental Direct Testimony. Staff's proposed rate design is reasonable
21 and should be adopted by the Commission.

22
23
24
25
26

¹¹⁵ Ex. S-26 (Smith Supplemental Direct) at 5.

27 ¹¹⁶ *Id.*

¹¹⁷ *Id.* at 6.

28 ¹¹⁸ *Id.* at 9.

¹¹⁹ Ex. S-26 (Smith Supplemental Direct) at 9.

1 IV. The Commission Should Reject the Company's Proposed Throughput Adjustment
2 Mechanism ("TAM") Which Would Shift Risk Normally Borne by the Company to Rate
3 Payers.

4 UNS Gas has also proposed a new Throughput Adjustment Mechanism ("TAM") in this
5 proceeding. Staff Witness Steven Ruback explained how the Company's proposed TAM would be
6 calculated in the following passage from his Direct Testimony:

7 The TAM is calculated by first establishing a base UPC (usage per
8 customer). The base UPC is calculated by the test year throughput
9 divided by the test year average number of customers. This is then
10 compared to the actual UPC which is calculated as the actual
11 throughput divided by the actual number of customers in a calendar
12 year. The difference between the base UPC and the actual UPC is then
13 multiplied by the test year's number of customers and the margin rate
14 per therm to arrive at the required throughput adjustment in dollars.
15 This dollar amount is then divided by the projected 12 month
16 throughput ("therms") to arrive at the adjustment per therm.¹²⁰

17 The TAM will either provide a credit or a surcharge to the existing customer's volumetric rate
18 charge based on usage per customer.¹²¹

19 The Staff opposes the Company's proposed TAM for several reasons.

20 First, Staff's expert testified that the type of costs traditionally recovered in an automatic adjustment
21 clause such as a TAM are skyrocketing and volatile costs, not within the Company's control, which if
22 not recovered in a timely manner, could jeopardize a utility's financial health.¹²² The Company's
23 proposed TAM does not meet this test.

24 First, traditional rate making has not left the Company in poor financial
25 health. Second, non-gas costs are relatively stable from year to year
26 and certainly not volatile to the same extent as gas costs. Third, non-
27 gas costs are within management's control.¹²³

28 In addition, the Company already has several revenue decoupling mechanisms such as the
TAM. One example is the customer charge, which is a fixed rate independent of throughput.¹²⁴
Another example is the PGA, which protects the Company from price hikes regardless of
throughput.¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Ex. S-23 (Ruback Direct) at 12-13.

¹²¹ *Id.* at 12.

¹²² *Id.*

¹²³ *Id.*

¹²⁴ Ex. S-23 (Ruback Direct) at 12.

¹²⁵ *Id.*

1 Few jurisdictions have approved the use of a TAM; and the TAM in those jurisdictions has
2 been far different than the broad-based, all-inclusive TAM proposed by the Company in this case.¹²⁶

3 This Commission rejected a similar proposal by Southwest Gas in Decision No. 68487.¹²⁷
4 The Commission, however, indicated that the Staff and stakeholders should continue to further
5 examine the TAM to see if agreement could be reached on the mechanism's use and appropriateness
6 in cases. The Staff is willing to undertake those discussions with stakeholders outside of this case to
7 see if such agreement can be reached.

8 In summary, the Commission should reject the Company's proposed TAM because it:

- 9 1) shifts the risk of declining usage attributable to weather and economics from
10 UNS shareholders to ratepayers;
- 11 2) it constitutes piecemeal ratemaking; and
- 12 3) it would discourage retail customers from undertaking conservation.¹²⁸

13 **V. The Commission Should Find that the Company's Natural Gas Procurement Practices
and Policies were Reasonable and Prudent during the Audit Review Period.**

14 In Docket Number G-4202A-05-0831, Staff conducted a complete audit of the Company's
15 natural gas procurement practices and policies. The audit review period was from September 2003
16 through December 2005.¹²⁹ The audit matter was filed on November 10, 2005. In a Procedural
17 Order issued on September 8, 2006, Administrative Law Judge Dwight D. Nodes ("Judge Nodes")
18 consolidated the audit with the other two dockets in the caption above.

19 Mr. Jerry E. Mendl, President of MSB Energy Associates, Inc. and Mr. George E. Wennerlyn,
20 President of Select Energy Consulting, LLC, conducted the audit on behalf of Staff. Mr. Mendl
21 issued six findings which are listed in his pre-filed Direct Testimony.¹³⁰ Staff requests that Mr.
22 Mendl's findings be adopted by the Commission. In finding number one, Mr. Mendl found that the
23 Company's procurement strategy and January 1, 2005 Price Stabilization Policy were prudent. At the
24 hearing, Mr. Mendel specifically testified, "I concluded that the natural gas procurement strategy that
25

26 ¹²⁶ TR Vol. V at 796.

27 ¹²⁷ See ACC Docket No. G-01551A-04-0876.

28 ¹²⁸ Ex. S-23 (Ruback Direct) at 19.

¹²⁹ TR Vol. IV at 761. See also Exhibit S-20 (Mendl Direct) at 1.

¹³⁰ Exhibit S-20 (Mendl Direct) at 1.

1 was set forth in the price stabilization policy was reasonable over the review period.”¹³¹ Mr.
2 Mendel’s other five findings related to the Price Stabilization Policy. Those findings are discussed in
3 part below.

4 In his pre-filed Direct Testimony, Mr. Wennerlyn made three conclusions based on his audit
5 and analysis. The conclusions are equivalent to findings of fact. In conclusion number one, Mr.
6 Wennerlyn concluded that the Company’s purchases from September 2003 through December 2005
7 were reasonable and prudent.¹³² Mr. Wennerlyn’s other two conclusions were recommendations on a
8 going forward basis. The recommendations are based on his audit and analysis of the Company’s
9 current procurement practices. Staff requests the Commission to adopt Mr. Wennerlyn’s three
10 conclusions or findings of fact.

11 **VI. The Applicant’s Gas Price Stabilization Policy Should not be Approved.**

12 UNS Gas requests approval of its Gas Price Stabilization Policy in this proceeding. In his
13 pre-filed Direct Testimony, Mr. David Hutchens explained the Company’s request:

14 We believe that instead of the Commission attempting to *second guess*,
15 *after the fact*, the individual acts that UNS Gas transacted in connection
16 with gas procurement and hedging, it is more productive and beneficial
17 to customers that the Commission review the policies and approve
18 them prospectively. That way the Company will know the clear
direction of the Commission and act accordingly. If the Company acts
within the approved policies, its transactions *will be conclusively*
prudent.¹³³

19 Staff urges the Commission to reject the Company’s request. Approval of the hedging policy would
20 insulate 45% of the Company’s gas purchases from subsequent prudency reviews. Pre-approval is
21 not necessary and could benefit the Company to the detriment of ratepayers.

22 UNS Gas witnesses attempt to dismiss Staff’s concerns about pre-approval. In his Rebuttal
23 Testimony, Mr. Hutchens argued that the policy “would not put the Company on ‘autopilot.’”¹³⁴ He
24 explained:

25
26 ¹³¹ TR Vol. IV at 761.

27 ¹³² Exhibit S-18 (Wennerlyn Direct) at 4.

28 ¹³³ Exhibit UNSG-4 (Hutchens Direct) at 7(emphasis added). Mr. Pignatelli may have made a minor concession at hearing. Mr. Pignatelli stated that, “if you follow [the Gas Price Stabilization Policy], you should be *presumptively prudent*.” TR Vol. I at 122.

¹³⁴ Exhibit UNSG-5 (Hutchens Rebuttal) at 10.

1
2 In practice, the Company has been very active in changing its Policy to
3 react to changing market conditions....The Company is committed to
4 continuing to this level of detailed, active review of its purchasing
5 strategies whether or not the Policy is approved by the Commission.¹³⁵

6 Notwithstanding Mr. Hutchens' explanation, he also stated that, "*It would not be acceptable for the*
7 *Company to implement a procurement policy that could later be second-guessed* due to something as
8 vague as 'changes in market conditions.'"

9 At hearing, UNS Gas President Mr. James S. Pignatelli explained the Company's view of
10 'second-guessing.' Mr. Pignatelli first stated that, "It's just my opinion, in the heat of a rate case
11 three or four years after the fact the circumstances extant when the transaction was entered into are
12 forgotten."¹³⁶ He then stated that, "The [C]ompany would always keep adequate documentation. But
13 in the heat [of a procurement review], I get afraid of *some political decision* down the road."¹³⁷

14 Instead of a typical prudence review, the Company requests a "compliance review." A
15 compliance review would be limited to "whether or not you're compliant with making the purchases
16 at the right volume and at the right times."¹³⁸ The Company also argues that upfront approval allows
17 stakeholders to review and comment on a hedging policy prior to implementation. It claims that prior
18 stakeholder input is preferable to after-the-fact prudency reviews.¹³⁹

19 The Company and Staff have a fundamental disagreement on the purposes of a hedging plan.
20 UNS Gas believes that the only purpose of a hedging policy is reducing volatility of natural gas
21 prices.¹⁴⁰ Mr. Hutchens specifically testified that the purpose of the Gas Stabilization Policy is to
22 "reduce the volatility of the overall price."¹⁴¹ He also stated that savings to customers is not one of
23 the purposes of the policy.¹⁴² Mr. Hutchens explained that the Company's policy is a "dollar cost
24

25 ¹³⁵ *Id.*

26 ¹³⁶ TR Vol. I at 106. See also *Id.* at 121.

27 ¹³⁷ TR Vol. I at 122-123 (emphasis added).

28 ¹³⁸ *Id.* at 157.

¹³⁹ *Id.* at 133-134. See also *Id.* at 137.

¹⁴⁰ *Id.* at 129; and 157. See also Exhibit UNSG-4 at 5-6.

¹⁴¹ TR Vol. I at 129.

¹⁴² *Id.*

1 averaging approach.” Mr. Hutchens believes that prices for hedged volumes have a 50/50 chance of
2 being “above or below market.”¹⁴³

3 Staff’s position is more complex than the Company’s position. Mr. Wennerlyn explained
4 Staff’s view of hedging policies:

5 I think there are three legs to the milk stool, and I think they all carry
6 equal value. And you have [1] the stability [of prices], [2] the
7 reliability [of physical supplies] and [3] the competitiveness, in other
words, the *potential to get the lowest possible cost*.¹⁴⁴

8 Mr. Wennerlyn acknowledged that a cost premium necessary to achieve stability may be considered
9 prudent.¹⁴⁵ He also testified that under some market conditions hedged prices could be prudent and
10 above market.¹⁴⁶ But costs and the level of stability achieved must be reviewed in the context of all
11 relevant factors.

12 Moreover, the third prong of Mr. Wennerlyn’s analysis is not second-guessing. Mr. Pignatelli
13 conceded that the Company “would always attempt to get the lowest possible price.”¹⁴⁷ The third
14 prong is necessary to determine whether actual purchases were made at *competitive* prices. Mr.
15 Wennerlyn acknowledged that the goals of low prices and stable prices may conflict at times.¹⁴⁸
16 Above market prices for hedged volumes do not automatically result in disallowances. The ultimate
17 goal is to evaluate all relevant factors and appropriately balance all information flowing from the
18 analysis.

19 Eliminating traditional prudency reviews would prevent Staff from using its three-prong
20 review of hedging plans. The Company’s “compliance” review would limit Staff’s evaluation to the
21 volumes purchased and the timing of purchases under the plan. If the Company followed the plan, it
22 would be deemed “conclusively” or “presumptively” prudent.

23 Mr. Mendel testified that one of the reasons for a full prudence review is that the Company
24 has discretion under its policy.¹⁴⁹ Mr. Mendel expressed concern about the “higher burden of proof

25
¹⁴³ *Id.*

26 ¹⁴⁴ TR Vol. IV at 744-745(emphasis added). See also *Id.* at 736.

27 ¹⁴⁵ *Id.* at 752-755.

¹⁴⁶ *Id.*

¹⁴⁷ TR Vol. I at 104.

28 ¹⁴⁸ TR Vol. IV at 751.

¹⁴⁹ *Id.* at 768.

1 [for Staff] to prove [a purchase] wasn't prudent." A "compliance" review could insulate the
2 Company for its discretionary purchases. Therefore, the Company may not receive a disallowance
3 even if exercise of its discretion was imprudent.

4 For example, "a utility could be operating on the basis of sticking to a plan even though it was
5 no longer prudent based on the [market] conditions that occurred at [the time of a purchase]."¹⁵⁰ If
6 the Company didn't keep adequate documentation about market conditions, Staff may not meet the
7 higher burden of proof. The Commission should not approve a plan that would shift the burden of
8 proof to Staff when the Company is responsible for maintaining the evidence.

9 The Company appears concerned that future prudence reviews could use different "metrics."
10 Mr. Hutchens testified:

11there's a lot of different ways that you can evaluate hedging
12 policies. I mean, there's - - I think [Staff consultants] must have done
13 five or six themselves, and we could probably do another five or six.
14 And anyone you could throw that question out to could probably
provide different metrics on whether or not that would be deemed
prudent.¹⁵¹

15 Mr. Hutchens merely states the obvious.

16 Accounting and economic theory and practice are subject to change. For example,
17 methodologies for determining cost-of-capital are debated in every rate case. Purchases under a
18 hedging plan should not be afforded special ratemaking treatment. Other expenses are not
19 automatically accepted merely because theories change on what is considered a prudent and
20 allowable expense.

21 Most importantly, conducting a "compliance" review in place of a prudence review would
22 shield the Company from risk. Mr. Hutchens testified, "I think what we're trying to get at is a
23 surety."¹⁵² Mr. Hutchens explained that a "prudence review [would bring] into question the price.
24 That's the thing that we're trying to avoid."¹⁵³ Judge Nodes asked if insulation from risk could
25 "provide a disincentive for the company personnel who are responsible for those purchasing practices
26

27 ¹⁵⁰ *Id.* at 772.

28 ¹⁵¹ *Id.* at 137.

¹⁵² *Id.* at 137.

¹⁵³ *Id.* at 156-157.

1 to make informed and wise decisions.”¹⁵⁴ Mr. Hutchens responded, “[T]hat’s an appearance hurdle
2 that I can’t argue away.”¹⁵⁵

3 A compliance review is also a one-way street because ratepayers would not benefit from a less
4 rigorous review. Mr. Mendel addressed the issue with Judge Nodes:

5 ACALJ Nodes: Mr. Mendel, is there any advantage to the
6 Commission and/or the Company’s customers
7 in approving, if the price stabilization policy
8 were to be approved by the Commission, or are
the only benefits that accrue from Commission
approval of such a policy only to the
Company?

9 Mr. Mendel: [O]nly to the Company. I can’t think of any
10 reason....that a Commission approval of that
11 approach versus nonapproval of that approach
would make any difference in the ratepayer’s
perspective, *at least a favorable difference*.¹⁵⁶

12 Mr. Mendel also agreed with Judge Nodes that approval is intended to insulate the Company from
13 future risk.¹⁵⁷

14 Finally, the evidence demonstrates that pre-approval is simply not necessary. The Company
15 did not identify a single valid reason for pre-approval. Mr. Mendel described the regulatory standard
16 for reviewing gas purchases. He testified “that prudence has to be judged in the context of what was
17 known at the time decisions were being made. And I believe that that is a fairly standard view among
18 regulatory agencies.”¹⁵⁸ Pre-approval would change the above standard. The Company did not
19 provide any evidence that this standard is unfair.

20 Instead, the Company argued that future Staff personnel, and future Commissions, may
21 second-guess the Company’s decisions. Mr. Hutchens testified,

22 Mr. Gray might not be sitting there [three years after a purchase]. I
23 might not be sitting here. I don’t know who else would be looking at
24 this, and that’s where we’re trying to get protection.¹⁵⁹

26 ¹⁵⁴ *Id.* at 138.

27 ¹⁵⁵ *Id.* at 138-139.

28 ¹⁵⁶ TR Vol. IV at 778.

¹⁵⁷ *Id.*

¹⁵⁸ *Id.* at 772.

¹⁵⁹ TR Vol. I at 139.

1 Mr. Hutchens also criticized Mr. Mendel's pre-filed direct testimony. Mr. Mendel testified,
2 "Changes in market conditions would invalidate the approval."¹⁶⁰ Mr. Hutchens claims that Mr.
3 Mendel's testimony "is exactly the type of vague hindsight review that the Company is trying to
4 avoid with Commission approval of its Policy."¹⁶¹ Mr. Pignatelli expressed concern that future
5 Commissions could make "some political decision down the road."¹⁶²

6 Yet both witnesses testified that they have not experienced any problems in Arizona. Mr.
7 Pignatelli testified that he experienced "political decisions" in California, not Arizona.¹⁶³ He also
8 stated, "I have not seen any evidence of this concern. I think Staff is handling their prudence very
9 fairly and appropriately."¹⁶⁴ Mr. Hutchens concurred with Mr. Pignatelli.¹⁶⁵

10 Nevertheless, the Company argues that pre-approval is necessary and fair to get "upfront"
11 stakeholder input. Staff agrees that prior stakeholder input on hedging policies is a good idea. But
12 this process is already being used. And the Company could not provide any evidence that it would be
13 discontinued in the future. Mr. Hutchens could not identify any example of Staff not providing
14 "upfront" feedback on the Company's hedging policies.¹⁶⁶

15 Pre-approval is not necessary because the Company can protect itself by keeping adequate
16 documentation. Mr. Pignatelli testified, "My concern is, though, when you're buying a commodity
17 that moves hourly or every 15 minutes, that when you go back and retroactive[ly] look at it, you
18 might lose sight of what the actual situation was at the time that was being purchased."¹⁶⁷ He further
19 explained that a prudence review may "not fully take into consideration everything that was going on
20 at the time."¹⁶⁸ But Mr. Pignatelli conceded that adequate documentation could demonstrate the
21 circumstances occurring when a purchase was made.¹⁶⁹ Mr. Hutchens also conceded the point.¹⁷⁰

23 ¹⁶⁰ Exhibit S-20 (Mendl Direct) at 24.

24 ¹⁶¹ Exhibit UNSG-5 (Hutchens Rebuttal) at 11.

24 ¹⁶² TR Vol. I at 122.

25 ¹⁶³ *Id.* at 123.

25 ¹⁶⁴ *Id.* at 121.

26 ¹⁶⁵ *Id.* at 140. See also *Id.* at 139 ("up to this point we've been fine with it."); and 138 ("I would guess that I probably
would be pretty confident based on the way that Staff has analyzed it and their outside consultants, I would be.").

27 ¹⁶⁶ *Id.* at 158.

27 ¹⁶⁷ *Id.* at 121-122.

28 ¹⁶⁸ *Id.* at 122.

28 ¹⁶⁹ *Id.* at 122.

¹⁷⁰ *Id.* at 136-137.

1 Staff respectfully asks the Commission to reject the Company's request to approve its Gas
2 Price Stabilization Policy. Pre-approval would shift the burden of proof to Staff, and limit the issues
3 that could be reviewed. UNS Gas does not need pre-approval to obtain upfront stakeholder input.
4 The Company did not provide any evidence that pre-approval is necessary or that the current review
5 standard is unfair. Therefore, the request is unsupported by the evidence. Furthermore, pre-approval
6 would benefit the Company without providing offsetting benefits to ratepayers. Pre-approval is not in
7 the public interest.

8 **VII. Staff's Recommendations for the Purchased Gas Adjustor are Reasonable, Consistent**
9 **with a Policy of Gradualism, and Should be Adopted by the Commission.**

10 The Company filed an application to modify its purchased gas adjustor ("PGA") on January
11 10, 2006. The docket was consolidated with the other two captioned proceedings on September 8,
12 2006. In his Direct Testimony, Mr. Gray offered seven recommendations for the PGA mechanism.
13 Staff respectfully requests the Commission adopt all of his recommendations. Other than the
14 bandwidth and interest rates, the Company appears to accept Mr. Gray's remaining
15 recommendations.¹⁷¹

16 Staff and the Company agree that the bandwidth for the purchased gas adjustor ("PGA")
17 should be modified in this proceeding. The current bandwidth for UNS Gas is \$0.10 per therm. The
18 current bandwidth was set for all Arizona local distribution companies ("LDCs") in Decision No.
19 62994 on November 3, 2000.¹⁷²

20 In February 2006, the Commission changed Southwest Gas' bandwidth to \$0.13 per therm in
21 the company's most recent rate case.¹⁷³ In March 2006, the Commission changed Duncan Rural
22 Services' bandwidth in its most recent rate case. The Commission allowed the company to change its
23 PGA rate by \$0.10 per month or up to \$1.20 per year. The Commission provided extraordinary relief
24 to Duncan Rural Services because of its small size and financial distress.¹⁷⁴

25
26
27 ¹⁷¹ See e.g. Exhibit UNSG-5 (Hutchens Rebuttal) at 4-5.

28 ¹⁷² Exhibit S-41 (Gray Direct) at 5-6.

¹⁷³ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁷⁴ *Id.*

1 Staff witness Mr. Bob Gray recommends increasing UNS Gas' bandwidth to \$0.15 in this
2 proceeding.¹⁷⁵ Mr. Gray explained his recommendation:

3 Staff is cognizant of UNS' desire for greater flexibility in the PGA
4 bandwidth as well as the need for some amount of checks and balances
5 in how gas costs are passed on to customers, particularly in times when
6 gas prices are high and volatile....A \$0.15 per therm PGA bandwidth
7 provides significant additional room for movement of the monthly
8 PGA rate, while still providing a reasonable limit on the exposure of
9 UNS' customers to an automatic adjustment without Commission
10 review. Staff believes that a \$0.15 per therm bandwidth reasonably
11 balances Company and customer interests.¹⁷⁶

12 At the hearing, Mr. Gray explained that the PGA bandwidth must balance a
13 number of policy goals.

14 The goals include "the Company's ability to recover their gas costs, trying to provide some
15 cushion to ratepayers, [and] providing the Commission an opportunity to review large changes in
16 rates before they go into effect."¹⁷⁷ Mr. Gray also acknowledged that a bandwidth could result in a
17 company "accumulating large bank balances that ultimately must be paid by future customers."¹⁷⁸

18 The Company originally proposed eliminating the bandwidth or expanding it to \$0.25.¹⁷⁹ In
19 his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Hutchens agreed to \$0.20 per therm as proposed by the Residential
20 Utility Consumers Office ("RUCO").¹⁸⁰ The Company's primary complaint about the bandwidth is
21 that the mechanism dampens the price signal to customers.¹⁸¹

22 Staff agrees that the policy goals cited by the Company should be considered. But the
23 Commission must still balance multiple policy goals. Staff's proposal is intended to be "a more
24 gradual approach, with the Commission, Staff, RUCO, and other parties assessing the impacts of a
25 move to a \$0.15 per therm PGA bandwidth before possibly considering a larger change in future
26 proceedings."¹⁸² Staff's recommended change appropriately balances competing policy goals in this

25 ¹⁷⁵ *Id.* at 7.

26 ¹⁷⁶ *Id.* at 7-8.

27 ¹⁷⁷ TR Vol. VII at 1130-1131.

28 ¹⁷⁸ *Id.* at 1133.

¹⁷⁹ Exhibit UNSG-4 (Hutchens Direct) at 11-12.

¹⁸⁰ Exhibit UNSG-5 (Hutchens Rebuttal) at 4.

¹⁸¹ TR Vol. I at 130-131.

¹⁸² Exhibit S-42 (Gray Surrebuttal) at 2-3.

1 proceeding. Staff respectfully requests the Commission to adopt its recommendation of a \$0.15 per
2 therm PGA bandwidth.

3 In addition to the change in bandwidth, the Company asks the Commission to dramatically
4 change the interest rate on PGA bank balances. The Company seeks a two-tiered interest rate. It
5 requests the London Interbank Offered Rate ("LIBOR") plus 1.5% for balances up to twice the PGA
6 bank balance threshold.¹⁸³ Mr. Hutchens states that the requested interest rate is equivalent to "UNS
7 Gas' actual cost of new debt."¹⁸⁴ He testified that, "Under its revolving credit facility, UNS Gas pays
8 interest at a rate of LIBOR plus a credit spread of 1.5%."¹⁸⁵ Mr. Hutchens subsequently revised the
9 Company's request to LIBOR plus 1.0%.¹⁸⁶

10 Above the base level, the Company requests its "authorized weighted average cost of capital
11 as determined in this proceeding."¹⁸⁷ Mr. Hutchens argues that high bank balances cannot be
12 considered a short term asset on the Company's balance sheet. He testified that high bank balances
13 require longer-term investment capital in the form of working capital.¹⁸⁸ The Company also requests
14 long-term debt required for bank balances be excluded from its capital structure.¹⁸⁹

15 Staff opposes all of the Company's proposed changes for interest on bank balances. Interest
16 rates were originally set in a generic docket and applied uniformly to all Arizona LDCs.¹⁹⁰ Interest
17 rates were then modified in another generic docket. UNS Gas' current interest rate is "the monthly
18 three month commercial financial paper rate published by the Federal Reserve."¹⁹¹ The rate was
19 approved in Decision No. 68600 on March 23, 2006. Mr. Gray testified that there are no compelling
20 reasons for changing UNS Gas' interest rate.¹⁹²

21 Notwithstanding his testimony at the hearing, Mr. Gray offered an alternative in his Direct
22 Testimony. Mr. Gray discussed recent decisions in which the Commission approved different interest
23

24 ¹⁸³ Exhibit UNSG-4 (Hutchens Direct) at 12.

25 ¹⁸⁴ *Id.*

26 ¹⁸⁵ *Id.* at 13.

27 ¹⁸⁶ Exhibit UNSG-5 (Hutchens Rebuttal) at 5.

28 ¹⁸⁷ Exhibit UNSG-4 (Hutchens Direct) at 14.

¹⁸⁸ *Id.*

¹⁸⁹ *Id.* at 15.

¹⁹⁰ Exhibit S-41 (Gray Direct) at 13.

¹⁹¹ *Id.*

¹⁹² TR Vol. VII at 1131.

1 rates. In the most recent rate case for Southwest Gas (Decision No. 68487, dated February 23, 2006),
2 the Commission approved use of “the one-year nominal Treasury constant maturities rate.”¹⁹³ The
3 Commission has also approved the same rate for Arizona Public Service (“APS”).¹⁹⁴ Mr. Gray stated
4 that Staff would not be opposed to this rate as an alternative to retaining the existing rate.¹⁹⁵

5 UNS Gas did not present sufficient evidence demonstrating that its financial situation differs
6 substantially from Southwest Gas or APS.¹⁹⁶ Mr. Gray also testified that the Commission has never
7 used a utility’s cost of borrowing to determine interest rates on bank balances.¹⁹⁷ He explained that
8 interest rates higher than those previously approved could be a disincentive to a utility. In other
9 words, the utility may not timely seek approval to reduce bank balances.¹⁹⁸

10 **VIII. The Commission Should Adopt Staff’s Recommendations For UNS Gas’ Low-Income**
11 **Assistance Programs and Proposed DSM Programs; The Commission Should Not**
12 **Approve Exhibit UNSG-23 in this Proceeding; and the Commission Should not Approve**
13 **the Baseline Study and Include a Portion of the Costs in this Proceeding.**

14 Staff witness Ms. Julie McNeely-Kirwan reviewed the Company’s low-income assistance
15 programs and proposed demand-side management (“DSM”) programs. Ms. McNeely-Kirwan
16 provided eleven recommendations in her direct testimony.¹⁹⁹ Staff respectfully requests that the
17 Commission adopt Staff’s eleven recommendations, with the following modifications: (i) with
18 respect to the initial amount to be recovered through the DSM adjustor, Staff recommends a per-
19 therm DSM charge of \$0.0025, to recover the cost of the low-income weatherization program and one
20 quarter of the proposed budget for the remaining DSM program; and (ii) with respect to deadlines
21 applicable to the DSM adjustor, Staff recommends that the UNS DSM adjustor reset filing be done on
22 April 1, of each year, and that the annual adjustment be done on June 1 of each year. In addition,
23 Staff recommends that, since the Staff-recommended CARES discount is already included in the rate
24 design, that the \$441, 511 CARES discount proposed by UNS be removed from Operating Expenses.

25 ¹⁹³ Exhibit S-41 (Gray Direct) at 15.

26 ¹⁹⁴ *Id.*

27 ¹⁹⁵ *Id.* at 16.

28 ¹⁹⁶ *Id.* at 15.

¹⁹⁷ *Id.* at 15.

¹⁹⁸ *Id.* at 15-16.

¹⁹⁹ See Exhibit S-39 (McNeely-Kirwan Direct) at 31-32. Note that Ms. McNeely-Kirwan’s recommendation to maintain the currently monthly customer charge for CARES customers is also addressed in the rate design section of this brief.

1 Staff also requests that the Commission not approve UNG Gas Exhibit UNSG-23 in this
2 proceeding. Staff asks the Commission to follow the same procedures for approval of UNS Gas'
3 DSM programs as it as used for other utilities.²⁰⁰

4 Finally, the Commission should not approve a baseline study in this proceeding. Furthermore,
5 it should not include a portion of the costs in the DSM adjustor. Both decisions should be part of a
6 separate application to the Commission.

7 In recommendation number four, Staff recommended the following: "UNS Gas should submit
8 detailed DSM program proposals to the Commission as soon as possible, rather than waiting for the
9 conclusion of the UNS Electric rate case."²⁰¹ On March 23, 2007, Company witness Ms. Dennis A.
10 Smith filed a supplemental exhibit to her Rebuttal Testimony (Exhibit DAS-3).²⁰² In the filing, Ms.
11 Smith stated, "This supplemental exhibit contains UNS Gas' proposed Demand-Side Management
12 ("DSM") portfolio and *is being filed for informational purposes* so that Staff and others may better
13 evaluate UNS Gas' DSM programs in detail."²⁰³

14 At the hearing, Ms. Smith changed the Company's request regarding the filing. Ms. Smith
15 testified, "UNS Gas would prefer to have the Commission approve the DSM program portfolio *in this*
16 *case* so long as a decision in other matters is not affected by this program portfolio decision."²⁰⁴ Ms.
17 McNeely-Kirwan testified that the DSM portfolio should be submitted as a separate application.

18 She explained:

19 The portfolio plan should be filed as part of a separate application for
20 approval so Staff can review the plan in detail and submit and review
data requests and perform its own cost effectiveness evaluation.²⁰⁵

21 Ms. McNeely-Kirwan testified that review under a separate application is the Commission's routine
22 practice.²⁰⁶ Ms. Smith also conceded the issue in her testimony at the hearing.²⁰⁷

23
24
25 ²⁰⁰ See e.g. the process used for Southwest Gas in its most recent rate case (Decision No. 68487, dated February 23, 2006).

26 ²⁰¹ Exhibit S-39 (McNeely-Kirwan Direct) at 31.

27 ²⁰² At the hearing, the Company marked DAS-3 as UNSG-23 (Smith Rejoinder). TR Vol. III at 517.

28 ²⁰³ Exhibit UNSG-23 (Smith Rejoinder) at 1 (emphasis added).

²⁰⁴ TR Vol. III at 518.

²⁰⁵ TR Vol. VII at 1141.

²⁰⁶ *Id.* at 1141.

²⁰⁷ TR Vol. III at 597.

1 The Company appears to accept all of Staff's recommendations. Nevertheless, the Company
2 discussed its concern about some of the recommendations. For example, Ms. Smith argued that the
3 Societal Cost Test should not be the only cost-effectiveness test used to evaluate the portfolio.²⁰⁸ Ms.
4 McNeely-Kirwan testified that the Company could provide the results of other cost-effectiveness
5 tests. But at this time, Staff's position is that "the societal cost test is the best way of evaluating the
6 cost effectiveness of the DSM program."²⁰⁹


7 In her rejoinder testimony, Ms. Smith requested that \$82,000 of the costs of a baseline study
8 be included in the DSM adjustor in this proceeding.²¹⁰ She also requested that the baseline study be
9 approved in this proceeding.²¹¹ Staff opposes both requests.

10 Ms. McNeely-Kirwan testified that the costs of the baseline study could include costs for UNS
11 Electric and Tucson Electric Power ("TEP").²¹² She further testified that the no portion of the costs
12 for a baseline study should be approved in this proceeding. The study and its costs should be
13 submitted as part of the separate application.²¹³

14 **IX. Conclusion**

15 UNS Gas' application for a rate increase should be granted to the extent discussed in Staff's
16 testimony in this Docket. The Commission should reject the Company's proposed rate design and
17 TAM and other proposals which are designed to shift an abnormally high degree of risk away from
18 the Company to rate payers.

19 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 5th day of June 2007.

20
21 
22 Maureen A. Scott, Senior Staff Counsel
23 Keith A. Layton, Staff Attorney
24 Legal Division
25 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 542-3402

26 ²⁰⁸ See e.g. UNSG-22 (D. Smith Rebuttal) at 2-3.

27 ²⁰⁹ TR Vol. VII at 1143. See also *Id.* at 1149.

28 ²¹⁰ Exhibit UNSG-21 (D. Smith Direct) at 2.

²¹¹ *Id.*

²¹² TR Vol. VII at 1142-1143.

²¹³ *Id.* See also *Id.* at 1151, line 24 to 1152, line 18.

1 Original and Seventeen (17) copies
2 of the foregoing filed this 5th day
of June 2007 with:

3 Docket Control
4 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

6 Copies of the foregoing e-mailed/
7 mailed this 5th day of June
2007 to:


8 Michael W. Patten
9 Roshka DeWulf & Patten PLC
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren Street
Suite 800
10 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

11 Scott S. Wakefield
12 RUCO
1110 West Washington Street
Suite 220
13 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

14 Raymond S. Heyman
15 Michelle Livengood
UniSource Energy Services
One South Church Avenue
Suite 1820
16 Tucson, Arizona 85701

17 Cynthia Zwick, Executive Director
18 ACAA
2700 North 3rd Street, Suite 3040
19 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

20 Marshall Magruder
21 Post Office Box 1267
Tubac, Arizona 85646

22
23 
24
25
26
27
28